

involving forgotten or long unused names and those involving names that have all been in use, some more frequently than others.

In summary, the proposal to give the specific name *obesus* Baird, 1859 precedence over its senior subjective synonym *ater* Duméril, 1856, is based on questionable reasoning and would not promote nomenclatural stability or continuity. Accordingly, we ask that the Commission reject the proposal.

Two of us (K. de Queiroz and R.W. McDiarmid) have formulated a proposal that the holotype of *Sauromalus ater* should be set aside and that a neotype be designated, fixing the type locality as Isla Espiritu Santo, Gulf of California, Mexico. This was the locality to which Smith & Taylor (1950) restricted the species (para. 2 of the application).

Additional references

- Crother, B.I., Boundy, J., Campbell, J.A., de Queiroz, K., Frost, D.R., Highton, R., Iverson, J.B., Meylan, P.A., Reeder, T.W., Seidel, M.E., Sites, J.W. Jr., Taggart, T.W., Tilley, S.G. & Wake, D.B. 2000. Scientific and standard English names of amphibians and reptiles of North America north of Mexico, with comments regarding confidence in our understanding. *Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles, Herpetological Circular*, 29: 1–82.
- de Queiroz, K. 1995. Checklist and key to the extant species of Mexican iguanas (Reptilia: Iguania). *Publicaciones Especiales del Museo de Zoología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, 9: 1–48.
- Etheridge, R.E. 1982. Checklist of iguanine and Malagasy iguanid lizards. Pp. 7–37 in Burghardt, G.M. & Rand, A.S. (Eds.), *Iguanas of the world. Their behavior, ecology, and conservation*. Noyes Publications, Park Ridge, New Jersey.
- Flores-Villela, O. 1993. Herpetofauna Mexicana. *Carnegie Museum of Natural History Special Publication*, 17: 1–73.
- Liner, E.A. 1994. Scientific and common names for the amphibians and reptiles of Mexico in English and Spanish. *Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles, Herpetological Circular*, 23: 1–113.

Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN 53: 28–37, 125, 192–200, 286–288; 54: 119–129, 189; 55: 43–46, 119–120; 56: 72–73, 280–282; 58: 231–234)

Anthea Gentry

Littlewood, Copyhold Lane, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH17 5EB, U.K.

Juliet Clutton-Brock

Working Group on Nomenclature, International Council of Archaeozoology, c/o Department of Zoology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Colin P. Groves

*Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, The Australian National University,
Canberra, A.C.T. 0200, Australia*

Our application has received many comments since it was published and is now due for a ruling by the Commission. Before it is submitted for voting we should like to make clear the current situation in the usage of the names for wild species with domestic derivatives, how this might be seen to differ from a strict interpretation of the Code, and the consequences which would result from approval of our proposals.

Many wild species and their domestic derivatives share the same name. However, in a few, well known, cases the two are named separately: the wild species and their domestic derivatives are recognisable as distinct entities and it is usually necessary to separate them. Among these are 15 mammals in which the name for the wild ancestor postdates or is contemporary with that of the domestic form.

The treatment of wild and domestic forms as recognizable and distinct biological species, as conceived by the majority of workers, usually presents no problems in nomenclature. However, confusion arises when, in a minority of cases, the two forms are treated as conspecific and the senior name (based on the domestic form) is adopted, or when the forms are treated as separate and the name for the domestic form is then transferred to the wild taxon. Our application seeks to stabilise the current majority usage of the 15 names for wild mammal species, which are the first available names in use based on wild populations.

Our intentions regarding the names for wild and domestic forms, both when they are treated as separate species (two names) and when they are included in one species (one name), have been set out by ourselves (see BZN: 54: 128) and in comments by others (see, for example, Corbet in BZN 53: 193, Kitchener in BZN 53: 194, and Uerpmann in BZN 58: 233). The nomenclatural situation is no different from any other in taxonomy but, in accord with majority usage for several years, we do not follow priority in our use of names when the two forms are indistinguishable and are treated as one species. In BZN 58: 234 we noted: 'Approval of our proposals by the Commission will merely ratify the current nomenclatural situation: names based on wild populations will continue to be used for wild species and will include those for domestic forms if these are considered conspecific'. As noted above, our proposals apply to a very limited number of taxa.

Most commentators on our application have approved our proposals and there has been considerable support from workers in zoology, archaeozoology, palaeontology, conservation, ecology, ethology and endangered species management. There have been a few commentators who are not in favour but this seems to be because they have misunderstood the intention of the application: they have assumed that we were either proposing the suppression of senior names based on domestic forms or that two alternative names should be adopted as valid for the wild species. As noted in BZN 54: 127–129 and above, neither assumption is correct.

In this application we have confined our attention to the names for 15 wild ancestral species and have made no proposals for the naming of domestic animals. Names based on domestic animals in Linnaeus (1758, 1766) and other authors are available (Article 1.2.1 of the Code) but have not been universally adopted; having

been misapplied to the wild species by some authors they are inevitably compromised. A number of systems, some of which are notational, for naming domestic forms are currently in use (see para. 3 of the application). Approval of the current application will settle part of the problem and will allow the use of names for domestic animals to be formalised by subsequent agreement between all those interested.